1 2 3 4 5 6 7 United States District Court 8 Eastern District of California 9 10 11 Jesse Simkins, 12 13 Plaintiff, No. Civ. S 04-1433 DFL PAN P Order 14 vs. 15 Foothill Orthopedic Medical Center, et al., 16 Defendants. 17 18 -000-19 December 15, 2005, defendants Ingalls (aka Ingles) and Pires 20 moved to compel answers to interrogatories and requests for 21 admissions served September 6, 2005, and for sanctions. 22 Plaintiff did not respond to the discovery, nor to an October 27, 23 2005, letter. He has not opposed the motion to compel. 24 motion is granted. 25 Defendants seek sanctions. This court must apportion

expense-shifting sanctions "in a just manner," taking into

26

Case 2:04-cv-01433-DFL-PAN Document 38 Filed 02/08/06 Page 2 of 2

account the extent to which the opposing party's objections to discovery were substantially justified. Fed. R. Civ. P. 37(a)(4)(c); see also Reygo Pac. Corp. v. Johnson Pump Co., 680 F.2d 647, 649 (9th Cir. 1982) (expenses ordinarily awarded unless court finds losing party's position was justified); 7 James Wm. Moore et al., Moore's Federal Practice para. 37.23[1] (courts apply rebuttable presumption in favor of imposing expense shifting sanctions on party against whom motion to compel is resolved). Plaintiff offers nothing to rebut the presumption of sanctions. His position, which was to ignore the discovery, letter and motion, was not substantially justified; it inconvenienced defendants and the court and will delay reaching the merits of this action.

Counsel seeks compensation for four hours' work in connection with the matter. The court finds that a fair sanction is \$450.00, which is two hours' work at \$225 per hour.

Accordingly, defendants' December 15, 2005, motion to compel and for sanctions is granted. Within 20 days, plaintiff shall respond to defendants' discovery and remit \$450.00 to opposing counsel.

So ordered.

Dated: February 7, 2006.

/s/ Peter A. Nowinski PETER A. NOWINSKI Magistrate Judge